UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/666,681	09/18/2003	Leonard Robert Speiser	2043.093US1	8255	
.,	7590 07/15/200 I, LUNDBERG & WO	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 2938		SHEIKH, ASFAND M			
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3627		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/15/2009	ELECTRONIC	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@SLWIP.COM

		Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/666	,681	SPEISER ET AL.		
		Examir	ner	Art Unit		
		Asfand	M. Sheikh	3627		
Ti Period for R	he MAILING DATE of this commu eply	nication appears on	the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ac	ddress	
A SHOR' WHICHE - Extension after SIX ( - If NO peri - Failure to Any reply	TENED STATUTORY PERIOD F VER IS LONGER, FROM THE M s of time may be available under the provision 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com of for reply is specified above, the maximum sreply within the set or extended period for repl received by the Office later than three months tent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no munication. tatutory period will apply an y will, by statute, cause the	THIS COMMUNIC event, however, may a red d will expire SIX (6) MON application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•	
Status						
2a)⊠ Thi 3)⊡ Sir	sponsive to communication(s) files action is <b>FINAL</b> .  In the condition is in condition seed in accordance with the pract	2b)⊡ This action is for allowance exce	s non-final. pt for formal mat	•	e merits is	
Disposition	of Claims					
4a) 5)	specification is objected to by the	are withdrawn from ction and/or election	n requirement.	in stad to by the Everying		
App Rep	drawing(s) filed on 22 March 20 blicant may not request that any object blacement drawing sheet(s) including oath or declaration is objected t	ection to the drawing(sg the correction is req	s) be held in abeyar uired if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).	
Priority und	er 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
2) Notice of 3) Information	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( on Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) (s)/Mail Date <u>6/5/2009</u> .	PTO-948)	Paper No(	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 		

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 6/5/2009 was filed after the mailing date of the Examiner's Answer on 12/11/2007. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

## Response to Arguments

The examiner has reproduced the response as found in the Examiner's Answer with respect to the arguments presented in the Appellant's Appeal Brief.

Claims 15-22 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) for being anticipated by Spiegel et al. (US 6,466,918).

Regarding the argument that Spiegel et al. fail to disclose "identifying at least one frequently used search term associated with the identified division," Spiegel et al. indeed disclose "identifying at least one frequently used search term associated with the identified division," for example, the frequently-used search term "Olympics" associated with the second identified division under "Featured Categories" in Figure 1. See, in particular, column 7, lines 6-67. Note that, although all claims have been interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification have not been read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Application/Control Number: 10/666,681 Page 3

Art Unit: 3627

Regarding the argument that Spiegel et al. fail to disclose "providing a link to the user to listings associated with the at least one frequently used search term," Spiegel et al. indeed disclose "providing a link to the user to listings associated with the at least one frequently used search term," since the items/listings shown in Figure 1 are hyperlinks. See, in particular, column 4, lines 61-67. Note that, although all claims have been interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification have not been read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

To the extent that appellant is arguing that the references applied in the rejection fail to use the same names/words for certain elements as the names used by applicant, the argument is irrelevant, as it is noted that the disclosure in a reference must show the claimed elements arranged in the same manner as in the claims, but *need not be in the identical words* as used in the claims in order to be anticipatory. See *In re Bond*, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

To the extent that appellant is arguing that the disclosure in the applied prior art is not in as complete detail as is recited by the instant claims, a reference anticipates a claim if it discloses the claimed invention such that a skilled artisan could take its teachings *in combination with his own knowledge* of the particular art and be in possession of the invention. See *In re Graves*, 36 USPQ2d 1697 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *In re Sasse*, 207 USPQ 107 (CCPA 1980); *In re Samour*, 197 USPQ 1 (CCPA 1978).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Spiegel et al. (US 6,466,918).

Spiegel et al. disclose a method of providing listing recommendations to users of a network-based commerce system including a plurality of listings 120 arranged in a plurality of divisions 130, the method including: identifying a division 110 of the plurality of divisions 130 based on user interaction with the network-based commerce system; identifying at least one frequently used search term associated with the identified division 110; and providing a link to the user to listings 120 associated with each frequently used search term 110. See, in particular: col. 4, lines 43-67; col. 6, lines 5-60; col. 7, lines 6-67; col. 8, lines 33-59; and, Figure 1A.

Regarding claim 16, the method of Spiegel et al. includes communicating a web page to the user including a hyperlink to the listings associated with each frequently used search term. See, in particular, column 4, lines 61-65.

Regarding claim 17, in the method of Spiegel et al. the listings associated with each frequently used search term are listings that would be located if the user

conducted a search of the network-based commerce system using each frequently used search term.

Regarding claim 18, in the method of Spiegel et al. the at least one frequently used search term is ranked in one of an ascending and descending order according to a number of occurrences of listings in a division associated with the at least one frequently used search term.

Regarding claim 19, the method of Spiegel et al. inherently includes periodically adding new listings and removing terminated listings prior to determining the number of listings in each division associated with each frequently used search term so that the ranking is dependent upon supply and demand for the listings.

Regarding claim 20, the method of Spiegel et al. includes searching the network-based commerce system using at least one frequently used search term when the user selects the link.

Regarding claim 21, in the method of Spiegel et al. the at least one frequently used search term is displayed according to rank in one of an ascending and descending order.

Regarding claim 22, in the method of Spiegel et al. one or more frequently used search terms are assigned to each of the plurality of divisions, the divisions being defined by categories.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asfand M. Sheikh whose telephone number is (571)272-1466. The examiner can normally be reached on 9a-5p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan M. Zeender can be reached on (571)272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/666,681 Page 7

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Asfand M. Sheikh/ Examiner, Art Unit 3627 9 July 2009

> /F. Ryan Zeender/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627